

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 20, 2003. Claims 45, 46, 48, 49, and 51-65 are pending in this application. Claims 45, 48, and 51, the only independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention, in terms that distinguish over the art of record. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 45, 46, 48, 49, and 51-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,228,118 (Sasaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,580,177 (Gase et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 45, 48, and 51, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the proposed combination of the cited prior art at least for the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 45 is an information processing apparatus that includes a determiner, inquirer, and receiver. The determiner sends an inquiry to a network in order to determine a presence or an absence of a printer selected by a user connected to the network. The inquirer makes an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer connected to the network if the determiner determines the presence of the printer connected to the network. The receiver receives information about the printer language supported by the printer, wherein the information about the printer language is sent in response to the inquiry.

One important feature of Claim 45 is the determiner, which seeks to determine a presence or an absence of a printer selected by a user. In an information processing apparatus that has the features recited in Claim 45, the printer is selected by the user, a first inquiry is made to determine the presence or absence of the selected printer to determine the active printer, and a second inquiry is made to determine the language

supported by the active printer (if any is found). With these features, a user can be notified of a language supported by a printer by just selecting the printer.

Sasaki, as understood by Applicants, relates to a printer system wherein one of the printer drivers through which print data is sent from a data processor to a printer is selected based on interpreters available on the printer. The Office Action states (and Applicants agree) that Sasaki “does not teach a determiner adapted for determining a presence or absence of a printer connected to a network by inquiring information of the network.” *A fortiori*, that patent certainly does not teach or suggest a determiner that determines the presence or absence of a printer selected by a user, as recited in Claim 45.

Gase et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a printer/client network with centrally updated printer drivers and printer status monitoring. The Office Action states in the “Conclusion” section that Gase et al. teaches “actively sending an inquiry about information to a network to determine a presence or absence of a printer connected to the network” and particularly cites the specification in Gase et al. at column 4, lines 35-37, and column 5, for this teaching. Applicants note, however, that column 4, lines 35-37, of Gase et al. discusses a printer administration utility that enables the file server to indicate to each client processor a list of available printer/plotters found on the network. In addition, column 5 relates to gathering status information, listing system conditions and printer status, and an automated status response that relieves the user from having to know where to inquire to find status information from each of the subsystems that are apparently critical to the performance of the print job. Applicants submit that nothing has been found in these sections, or any other sections, of Gase et al. that would teach or suggest a determiner that sends an inquiry to a network in order to determine a presence or an absence of a printer selected by a user connected to the network.

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons discussed above, the proposed combination of Sasaki and Gase et al., assuming such combination would even be permissible, would still fail to teach or suggest the determiner, which sends an inquiry to a network in order to determine a presence or an absence of a printer selected by a user connected to the network, as recited in Claim 45. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 45 is patentable over these two patents, taken separately or in any proper combination.

Independent Claims 48 and 51 include the same feature of the determiner, as discussed above in connection with Claim 45. Accordingly, Claims 48 and 51 are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 45.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance

prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29 286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 377393v1